

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 1-10 and 26-33.

Claims 1-33 were pending in this application. Claims 11 and 21 have been amended. No claim has been cancelled or added. Accordingly, claims 1-33 will be pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. Support for the amendment to each of independent claims can be found, for example, in the originally filed claims of the present application. No new matter has been added. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2004, claims 1-10 and 26-33 were allowed, claims 11-25 were rejected as follows:

- Claims 11, 12, 15, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,904);
- Claims 13, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson further in view of Pershan (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0034289);
- Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Parker (U.S. Patent No. 5,661,791);
- Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Carrion et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,585); and
- Claims 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, in view of Carrion et al, and further in view of Parker.

To the extent any of these rejections might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Each of independent claims 11 and 21 is believed to have been amended to include allowable subject matter recited of claims 1 and 26.

For example, claim 11 has been amended to recite, among other elements:

transferring the call from the customer premises equipment to a component in the telephone network;

reviewing, by the component, a subscriber list related to the subscriber based at least in part on the sequence of keys.

By the foregoing amendment, Applicants believe the § 102(b) rejection based on Anderson has been overcome because Anderson does not teach at least the above two elements recited in amended claim 11.

Similarly, claim 21 has been amended to overcome the § 103(a) rejection based on Anderson in view of Carrion. Applicants believe none of the references of record teach “transferring the call from the customer premises equipment to a component of the telephone network” and “reviewing, by the component, the member information of the subscriber list,” as recited in amended claim 21.

At least due to their dependencies from claims 11 and 21, claims 12-20 and 22-25 are also believed to be allowable over all rejections of record.

Serial No.: 09/961,411  
Art Unit: 2645

Attorney's Docket No.: BS01-092  
Page 11


In view of the foregoing all claims 1-33 in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703-770-7696

Date: June 14, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT BEZNER, ET AL.

By:   
Poh C. Chua  
Registration No. 44,615

PCC/RAR

Customer No. 28970